

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/775,677	SOLEM ET AL.
	Examiner Urmī Chattpadhyay	Art Unit 3738

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Urmī Chattpadhyay. (3) David J. Isabella.
 (2) Mark Garscia. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 November 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: None.

Claim(s) discussed: 22 and 40.

Identification of prior art discussed: Langberg et al. (USPN 6,402,781), Solem et al. (USPN 6,210,432).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-413)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussion of making withdrawn claims dependent on generic claims 22 and 40. With respect to the obviousness-type double patenting rejection, claims 22, 30, 37 and 40 are not patentably distinct over claim 1 of Solem et al. (6,210,432) because both claim an elongated body adapted to be positioned in the coronary sinus and to exert a force on the mitral valve annulus when changed from a first configuration to a second configuration. Discussion of filing a continuation application directed towards a combination of the medical device and deployment system. Claims 38 and 39 remain rejected under 112, second paragraph.